

REMARKS

The Office action dated April 19, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto.

The disclosure stands objected to because of certain informalities. The paragraph that begins on Page 5, line 10 has been corrected. In the paragraph that begins on Page 7, line 8, "60" has been changed to "62."

Claim 14 stands objected to because of certain informalities. At line 13, after "third," "second" has been deleted. However, the singular article "a" has not been inserted in lines 9, 11, and 13 because the noun modified by each article is plural. The suggested articles and the nouns they modify would not agree in number, if the proposed changes were made. Therefore, no change has been made to these lines.

Claims 1 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Thomas et al. (U.S. 5,458,014). The Office action states that Claims 3-6, 8-10, and 12 are objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 is the base claim from which these claims depend. Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of Claim 3. Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled. Claims 11 and 13 have been withdrawn. Therefore, Claim 1 and the claims that depend from it, Claims 4-10 and 12, appear now in condition for allowance.

The Office action further states that Claims 14-22 are allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the claims remaining in the application, claims 1, 4-10, 12, and 14-22 appear now in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank G. McKenzie
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 29,242

Dated: May 3, 2006
MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
(734) 542-0900
(734) 542-9569 (fax)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY